



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,515	10/30/2006	Bei Wang	CN020023	2067
24737 7590 01/29/2010 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
HOANG, SON T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2165				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/29/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

<b>Application No.</b> 10/580,515	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WANG ET AL.
<b>Examiner</b> SON T. HOANG	<b>Art Unit</b> 2165

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 15 January 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: None.  
Claim(s) objected to: None.  
Claim(s) rejected: 26-30.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165

/S. T. H./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2165

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The arguments in the amendment filed on January 15, 2010 have been fully considered but are not persuasive. The amendment will be entered for appeal purposes.

First, Applicant argues towards the combination of Lin and Mercer regarding that it does not teach or disclose "an optical storage medium comprising: a plurality of content object files including a plurality of data types having a plurality of data formats for playback on a data processing system appropriate for playback of at least one data format" in independent claim 26.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the above remarks. Accordingly, Lin teaches a disk may be used to store different 'programs' wherein a program is defined as "any form of packetized data such as audio data, telephone messages, computer programs, Internet web pages or other communications" ([Column 2, Lines 64-67]). Furthermore, Lin discloses these different programs and program types are indexed using a search pointer table ([Column 5, Lines 30-36]). It is well inherent that the claimed at least one data format playable by the processing system may be audio or video data formats.

Second, Applicant argues towards the combination of Lin and Mercer regarding that it does not teach or disclose a generic logic format that includes "at least two content object files, wherein the data format of at least two of the content object files is different" in independent claim 26.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the above remarks. Accordingly, Lin teaches a generic logic format that includes "at least two content object files, wherein the data format of at least two of the content object files is different" (Figure 7 shows a flowchart for providing volume/file structure and navigation data compatible with different data formats, [Column 8, Lines 7-9]). Furthermore, Lin show a plurality of different data formats is indexed using a search pointer table ([Column 5, Lines 30-36]). That is, the plurality of different data formats is indexed and represented by the volume/file structure (claimed generic data format).

Rejections for claims 27-30 are also maintained for the similar reasons presented above. Since the arguments are not persuasive, rejections of the Final Office action mailed on November 17, 2009 are hereby sustained.